Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 21 1993
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 92-1078

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1992

CLYDE BOUDREAUX, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

KENNETH W. STARR
Solicitor General
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2217

THEODORE G. HESS
Colonel, USMC

J. CRANDALL FOSTER
Lieutenant, JAGC, USNR
Appellate Government Counsel
Appellate Government Division, NAMARA
Washington, D.C. 20374-1111

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Appointments Clause of the Constitution, Art. II, § 2, Cl. 2, prohibits Congress from authorizing the Judge Advocate General to select commissioned officers in the military to serve as court-martial trial judges.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Opinions below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Statement	2
Argument	3
Conclusion	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Allen v. *United States*, cert. denied, 113 S. Ct. 324 (1992)	3, 5
Bolado v. *United States*, *cert. denied*, 113 S. Ct. 321 (1992)	3
Davis v. *United States*, 411 U.S. 233 (1973)	5
Freytag v. *Commissioner*, 111 S. Ct. 2631 (1991)	4, 5
Murray v. *Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478 (1986)	5
Solorio v. *United States*, 483 U.S. 435 (1987)	4
Taylor v. *Freeland & Kronz*, 112 S. Ct. 1644 (1992)	4
United States v. *Coffman*, 35 M.J. 591 (N.-M.C.M.R. 1992)	5
United States v. *Prive*, 35 M.J. 569 (C.G.C.M.R. 1992)	5
United States v. *Weiss*, No. 67869/MC (C.M.A. Dec. 21, (1992)	5
Wainwright v. *Sykes*, 433 U.S. 72 (1977)	5
Williams v. *United States*, cert. denied, 113 S. Ct. 379 (1992)	3
Youakim v. *Miller*, 425 U.S. 231 (1976)	4

Constitution, statutes, and rule:

U.S. Const. Art. II, § 2, Cl. 2 (Appointments Clause)	3, 4

Statutes and rule—Continued: Page

Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*:
Art. 66, 10 U.S.C. 866 2
Art. 67(d), 10 U.S.C. 867(d) 4
Art. 67(h)(1), 10 U.S.C. 867(h)(1) 4
Art. 69, 10 U.S.C. 869 2
Art. 92, 10 U.S.C. 892 2
Art. 107, 10 U.S.C. 907 2
Art. 134, 10 U.S.C. 934 2
28 U.S.C. 1259(3) 4
Courts-Martial R. 905(e) 3, 5

Miscellaneous:

Manual for Courts-Martial, United States—1984 3

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1992

No. 92-1078

CLYDE BOUDREAUX, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Military Appeals, Pet. App. 1a-12a, is reported at 35 M.J. 291. An earlier opinion of the Court of Military Appeals, Pet. App. 15a-19a, is reported at 28 M.J. 181. Opinions of the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review, Pet. App. 20a-42a and 49a-60a, are reported at 33 M.J. 649 and 26 M.J. 879. Other opinions of the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review, Pet. App. 43a-48a and 61a-65a, are not officially reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Military Appeals was entered on September 24, 1992. The petition for a writ of

certiorari was filed on December 22, 1992. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1259(3).

STATEMENT

Following a general court-martial in 1974, petitioner was convicted of violating lawful general regulations, signing a false official affidavit, and false swearing in violation of Articles 92, 107, and 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. 892, 907, and 934. Petitioner was sentenced to dismissal. On appeal, the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review rejected four assignments of error, but concurred in another. The court set aside the findings of guilty to four specifications of violating 10 U.S.C. 892, set aside the sentence, and remanded the case for a rehearing on those four counts and on the sentence for all of the charges. Pet. App. 61a-65a. At the rehearing, petitioner pleaded guilty to only three of the four specifications and was sentenced to a reprimand, a fine of $1,000, and a loss of 2,950 numbers on the appropriate lineal list.[1]

Because petitioner's case no longer included any punishments bringing it within the jurisdiction of the Navy-Marine Court of Military Review, the case was reviewed and affirmed by the Office of the Judge Advocate General, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 869. The case was then misplaced for ten years, but subsequently discovered and sent to the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review for review pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 866.

The Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review declined to exercise what it then deemed to be merely its ancillary jurisdiction and returned the case to the Judge

---

[1] A reduction on the lineal list is a lowering of an officer's precedence for all purposes of quarters priority, board, and court seniority, and all other seniority privileges, including actual promotion. Petitioner retains his original position for purposes of consideration for retention or promotion.

Advocate General. Pet. App. 49a-54a. The Court of Military Appeals, on an application for mandamus, directed the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review to review the case. Pet. App. 15a-19a. The court of military review then affirmed the conviction and sentence on rehearing. Pet. App. 43a-48a. The Court of Military Appeals affirmed the decision of the court of military review. Pet. App. 1a-12a.

ARGUMENT

Petitioner maintains that the military trial judge was not qualified to hold that position because he was appointed to it by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy in violation of the Appointments Clause of the Constitution, Art. II, § 2, Cl. 2. That claim does not warrant review by this Court, for several reasons.[2]

First, petitioner has not properly preserved his claim for review by this Court. Petitioner did not raise this contention at or before trial and, therefore, has waived his claim under the rules of military procedure. Rule for Courts-Martial 905(e), *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States—1984*, at II-109.[3] Petitioner also did not

---

[2] This Court has denied certiorari on that question twice this Term. *Allen* v. *United States*, cert. denied, 113 S. Ct. 324 (1992); *Williams* v. *United States*, cert. denied, 113 S. Ct. 379 (1992); see also *Bolado* v. *United States*, cert. denied, 113 S. Ct. 321 (1992) (applying same principle to the selection of judges on the courts of military review). There is no reason to treat the petition in this case differently.

[3] Rule 905(e) provides as follows:

> Failure by a party to raise defenses or objections or to make requests which must be made before pleas are entered under subsection (b) of this rule shall constitute waiver. The military judge for good cause shown may grant relief from the waiver. Other requests, defenses, or objections, except lack of jurisdiction or failure of a charge to allege an offense, must be raised before the court-martial is finally adjourned for that case and,

raise this claim in the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Military Review or in the Court of Military Appeals, and neither court addressed petitioner's contention. Petitioner, therefore, cannot raise that claim for the first time in this Court. See, *e.g.*, *Taylor* v. *Freeland & Kronz*, 112 S. Ct. 1644, 1649 (1992) ("[O]rdinarily, this Court does not decide questions not raised or resolved in the lower court[s].") (quoting *Youakim* v. *Miller*, 425 U.S. 231, 234 (1976)); *Solorio* v. *United States*, 483 U.S. 435, 451 n.18 (1987).[4]

Relying on *Freytag* v. *Commissioner*, 111 S. Ct. 2631 (1991), petitioner asks this Court to forgive his waiver. *Freytag* involved an Appointments Clause challenge to the selection of special trial judges by the chief judge of the Tax Court, a challenge that the petitioners had not raised in that court. This Court said that it had the power to excuse the petitioners' waiver, and found

---

unless otherwise provided in this Manual, failure to do so shall constitute waiver.

[4] The Court of Military Appeals did not grant review on this question. Accordingly, it is not clear that this question is subject to review by certiorari in this Court. The statutes providing for certiorari review of the judgments of the Court of Military Appeals, 28 U.S.C. 1259(3) and 10 U.S.C. 867(h)(1), restrict this Court's certiorari jurisdiction to "[d]ecisions" of the Court of Military Appeals. Article 67(h)(1), UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. 867(h)(1), further provides that this Court may not review by certiorari "any action of the Court of Military Appeals in refusing to grant a petition for review." The Court of Military Appeals has the statutory right to limit its decisions in any case to less than all the issues urged by the accused. See 10 U.S.C. 867(d). Since petitioner did not raise this issue for review by the Court of Military Appeals, there is a question whether that court rendered a "[d]ecision" ~~on the~~ issue that petitioner presents in his petition. For the reasons given in the text, however, it is unnecessary to answer that question in this case, since the question presented in the certiorari petition does not warrant review by this Court in any event.

Freytag to be "one of those rare cases in which we should exercise our discretion to hear petitioners'challenge" despite their failure to assert it in the courts below. 111 S. Ct. at 2639. Petitioner urges the Court to follow the same approach in this case.

Freytag, however, did not involve a rule of procedure, like Rule for Courts-Martial 905(e), requiring a defendant to raise a claim in a timely manner on pain of forfeiture. That difference is material. For the past two decades, this Court has consistently declined to review defendants' claims that have not been properly preserved under the rules of trial and appellate procedure unless the defendant can establish both "cause" and "actual prejudice" for his default. See, *e.g.*, *Davis* v. *United States*, 411 U.S. 233 (1973); *Wainwright* v. *Sykes*, 433 U.S. 72 (1977); *Murray* v. *Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478 (1986). Petitioner has made no effort to satisfy that test. In any event, petitioner has not explained why the question in this case is of such imperative public importance that this Court should deviate from its firmly settled practice of declining to serve as a nisi prius court.

Second, there is no conflict among the circuits on the question presented by the petition. The Court of Military Appeals and two courts of military review have rejected the claim raised by petitioner. *United States* v. *Weiss*, No. 67869/MC (C.M.A. Dec. 21, 1992); *United States* v. *Prive*, 35 M.J. 569 (C.G.C.M.R. 1992); *United States* v. *Coffman*, 35 M.J. 591 (N.-M.C.M.R. 1992). No federal appellate court has ruled to the contrary.

Third, petitioner's claim lacks merit. The question presented in this case is identical to the one presented in *Allen* v. *United States*, cert. denied, 113 S. Ct. 324 (1992)

(No. 92-273). We rely upon our brief in opposition in that case.[5]

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted.

KENNETH W. STARR
Solicitor General

THEODORE G. HESS
Colonel, USMC

J. CRANDALL FOSTER
Lieutenant, JAGC, USNR
Appellate Government Counsel
Appellate Government Division,
NAMARA

JANUARY 1993

---

[5] We have supplied petitioner's counsel with a copy of our brief in opposition in *Allen*.